



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/417,864	10/13/1999	LOA ANDERSSON	2204/189	8056

2101 7590 07/28/2003

BROMBERG & SUNSTEIN LLP  
125 SUMMER STREET  
BOSTON, MA 02110-1618

EXAMINER

GEORGE, KEITH M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2663

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/417,864

Applicant(s)

ANDERSSON ET AL.

Examiner

Keith M. George

Art Unit

2663

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 May 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 October 1999 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>Z</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Objections*

1. Claim 25 is objected to because of the following informalities: The claim references claim 145, it should probably reference claim 14. Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 4-6, 8-14, 17-19, 21-26, 29-31, 33-39, 43-46 and 50-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeSimone et al., U.S. Patent 6,212,548 (hereinafter DeSimone).

4. Referring to claims 1, 13, 14, 26, 38, 39, 46 and 53, the method of managing a virtual private network according to the applicant is clearly identical to the method of managing an internet chat session as described by DeSimone. DeSimone teaches that Internet Relay Chat (IRC) allows two or more users to converse through a "channel" or virtual "chat room" and that the chat rooms can also be set up as private chat rooms by participants seeking to have private communications with a selected one or more other participants. DeSimone goes on to teach that entering a particular chat room is typically effected using a list or menu of currently available chat rooms (column 1, lines 25-62). DeSimone also teaches in figures 4A, 4B, 4C, 5A, 5B, and

Art Unit: 2663

5C, that all users are aware of all other users by the names following "IN ROOM:" (identify all network devices in the set of network devices). A notify message, "\*\*\* DAVE ADDED \*\*\*" is sent to all devices when a new device is added as seen in figures 5A and 5B (forward a notify message to each network device in the set of network devices). A join message, "\*\*\* WELCOME \*\*\*", is sent to the new device (forward a join message to the given network device) as well as a list of all others in the room, "IN ROOM: DAWN, MIKE, DAVE" (including the set of network device identifiers), as shown in figure 5C. DeSimone teaches all of the above with the possible exception of receiving a request to join a given private network and storing the network device identifiers in a network device memory set. However, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that a user would select a room from the list described above and a request would go to a server requesting permission to enter the room. It would have also been obvious that the names of all those present in the room are stored in a database. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the list of chat rooms must reside on a server of some type and by selecting one of the rooms, a request must be sent requesting access to the room. It also would have been obvious to store the names of each member of a chat room in a database in order to forward the names of the current users along to a new user (columns 8-9). Although the method of DeSimone is directed towards an internet chat session and not to a virtual private network, it would be clear to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the teaching of DeSimone in communicating a variety of messages and in communicating mixed-mode messages (column 15, lines 54-63) including messages used to set up a virtual private network.

Art Unit: 2663

5. Referring to claims 4, 12, 17, 25, 29 and 37, DeSimone teaches the method as shown in claims 1, 14 and 26 above where it was stated that entering particular chat rooms is typically effected using a list or menu of currently available chat rooms. By selecting the name of the chat room the request must include an identifier to select the appropriate room.

6. Referring to claims 5, 18 and 30, DeSimone teaches the method as shown in claims 1, 14 and 26 above and also teaches the pseudo code shown in column 7 which clearly shows the behavior of the system when a new room is created and the chat room is added to the list of active chat rooms.

7. Referring to claims 6, 19 and 31, DeSimone teaches the method as shown in claims 1, 14 and 26 above and also teaches that the chat application in use is Internet Relay Chat (IRC) which clearly runs on the Internet, which is well known in the art to be a packet based network.

8. Referring to claims 8, 21 and 33, DeSimone teaches the method as shown in claims 1, 14 and 26 above and also teaches that each user in a conversation has a unique identifier associated with the user. This user identifier may be assigned specifically for the session or may be persistently associated with the user. Examples include an e-mail address or an Internet Protocol (IP) address (column 5, lines 40-45).

9. Referring to claims 9, 22, 34, 43 and 50, DeSimone teaches the method as shown in claims 1, 14, 26, 39 and 46 above and also teaches in figures 6A, 6B and 6C the process that occurs when a user leaves the chat room. A message is forwarded, "\*\*\* MIKE DROPPED \*\*\*", to each of the remaining members of the chat room. The pseudo code for this process is shown in columns 12-13.

Art Unit: 2663

10. Referring to claims 10, 23, 35, 44 and 51, DeSimone teaches the method as shown in claims 9, 22, 34, 43 and 50 above and also teaches in figure 6B that the user that dropped is no longer connected to the current chat room.

11. Referring to claims 11, 24, 36 and 45, DeSimone teaches the method as shown in claims 9, 23, 34 and 43 above and also teaches that there is a mechanism present to ensure that a request to leave a chat room from a participant is confirmed and that only the concerned participant is issuing the request (column 13, lines 31-34). Although DeSimone is silent on the specifics of this message, one of ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious to add the list of connected devices to this message to ensure all connections are dropped and that any participant in that chat room can not drop anybody else (column 13, lines 34-35).

12. Claims 2, 3, 7, 15, 16, 20, 27, 28, 32, 40-42, 47-49 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeSimone as applied to claims 1, 14, 26, 39 and 46 above, and further in view of J. Oikarinen, RFC 1459, Internet Relay Chat Protocol (hereinafter Oikarinen).

13. Referring to claims 2, 3, 15, 16, 27, 28, 40, 41, 47, 48 and 54, DeSimone teaches the method as described in claims 1, 14, 26, 39 and 46 above with the possible exception of detailing exactly how communication is established between an existing chat room and a new user wishing to join the room. However, both DeSimone and Oikarinen make it very clear that a communication path is established between the devices. This can easily be seen in 4-6 of DeSimone and section 4.2.1 of Oikarinen. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to establish communication between devices that wish to speak to each other in order that they may speak to each other. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 2663

ordinary skill in the art to have the requesting device connect to the existing network or to have the existing network connect to the requesting device.

Referring to claims 7, 20, 32, 42 and 49, DeSimone teaches the methods as shown in claims 1, 14, 26, 39 and 46 above with the possible exception of a method to authenticate the request to confirm the identity of a network device. Oikarinen teaches a password message for use in IRC that must be set before any attempt to register the connection is made (section 4.1.1). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the password feature of Oikarinen in the system of DeSimone. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this in order to give some level of security to the actual connection (Oikarinen, section 4.1).

### ***Response to Arguments***

14. Applicant's arguments filed 8 May 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

15. On Page 2 of the Response Under 37 CFR 1.111, referring to claim 1, applicant argues that VPNs are networks that have the look, feel, and security of a private network; however, they are actually deployed across third party networks, such as the Internet. Similarly, DeSimone teaches a private chat room (VPN) set up by a participant seeking to have private text communications with a selected one or more other participants. The server provides a separate chat room or channel not accessible by anyone not invited by those in the established private chat room (column 1, line 60 - column 2, line 3). DeSimone has also established the chat rooms are maintained on one or more chat servers and accessed via an on-line service (column 1, lines 30-

Art Unit: 2663

31). One of ordinary skill in the art would know that by on-line service, DeSimone is indicating a method by which a computing device is connected to the Internet. One of ordinary skill in the art would also know that the Internet is a public network, contrary to applicant's argument on page 3 that DeSimone's chat room application is agnostic as to whether the application traverses a public or private network. Therefore, it is clear that DeSimone is teaching a communication network that has the look, feel, and security of a private network (private chat room) that is deployed across a third party network (Internet).

16. Applicant continues to argue that DeSimone does not at all address any issues associated with management of VPNs. This may be possible, however, the recitation of managing a virtual private network has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

17. Applicant also argues that DeSimone does not address the issue of addition or removal of network devices from a VPN. Having already established a private chat room not accessible by anyone not invited by those in the established private chat room, it is clear that DeSimone is teaching a private network established over a public network (Internet); DeSimone also clearly teaches the addition and removal of users to the chat room as explained in reference to claim 1 above.



Art Unit: 2663

18. Applicant argues on pages 3-4 of the response that DeSimone is not directed towards network setup but is directed only toward an application that happens to send messages across a network that is already set up. It has been shown that DeSimone clearly teaches setting up a private chat room by a participant seeking to have private text communications with a selected one or more other participants. Clearly this private chat room is not already set up, but is set up at the request of a participant. DeSimone goes into detail, as described in reference to claim 1 above, on how a private chat room is set up.

19. The remaining independent claims 14, 26, 39, 46 and 53 and dependent claims 4-6, 8-13, 17-19, 21-25, 29-31, 33-38, 43-45 and 50-52 are similarly rejected under DeSimone.

20. Referring to claims 2, 3, 7, 15, 16, 20, 27, 28, 32, 40-42, 47-49 and 54, applicant argues that Oikarinen does not address management of VPNs. In response to applicant's arguments, the recitation of managing a virtual private network has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

### ***Conclusion***

21. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2663

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Keith M. George whose telephone number is 703-305-6531. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:00-4:30, every other F 7:00-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chau T. Nguyen can be reached on 703-308-5340. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9315 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4750.



Keith M. George  
July 23, 2003



CHAU NGUYEN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600